

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/621,950	ALPERT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Dinh	2825	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul Dinh, Patent Examiner. (3) _____.

(2) Joseph P. Lally, Attorney for Applicant(s). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 October 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 2 and similarly recited claims 9 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: USP 6440780.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Claim 2 and similarly recited claims 9 and 15 were discussed regarding whether the prior art of record Kimura et al (USP 6440780) teaches or suggests the limitation of claims 2, 9 and 15. After discussing and considering the claims and the prior art, the examiner determined that Kimura does not teach or suggest the limitation of claims 2, 9, and 15. Therefore, the examiner suggested the Attorney of the Applicant(s) that claim 2 and similarly recited claim 9 (and its parent/intervening claim) and claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim(s).

Paul Dinh

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul Dinh". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.